

CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke xxii: 32.

VOL. IX.

NEW YORK. JUNE 1892.

NO. 6.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC.

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

Specially designed for the enlightenment of
Roman Catholics and their conversion
to Evangelical Christianity.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR, PUBLISHER,
142 West Twenty-first Street,
New York, N. Y.

Subscription Per Year,.....\$1.00

Single Copies, 10 Cents.

Sample copies sent on application.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as
second-class matter.

CONTENTS.	PAGE.
Editorial Notes, - - -	162
Rome Invades the United States Senate, -	163
Another Nun Leaves the Convent, - -	164
A Liberal Catholic, - - -	164
Services in Christ's Mission, - - -	165
A Bogus Relic, - - -	166
Is It a Chicken Bone? - - -	168
CONVERTS FROM ROME, - - -	170
My Conversion and Experience, - - -	172
Father Chiniquy's Declaration, - - -	174
The Faribault School Question Approved, -	175
Monthly Record of Roman Catholic	
Events, - - -	177
Flattering the Priests, - - -	180
Can Corrigan Be Cardinal? - - -	180
Why the Roman Church Flatters Ameri-	
cans, - - -	182
Father McGlynn on the Parochial and	
Public Schools, - - -	185
The Remission of Sin—the Bible Versus	
Rome, - - -	186
Lives and Miracles of Roman Catholic	
Saints, - - -	189

SALVATION

FOR

ROMAN CATHOLICS.

JESUS SAID,

I am the door: by ME if any man
enter in, he shall be saved.

John x: 9.

Ask, and it shall be given you;
seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it
shall be opened unto you.

For every one that asketh receiveth;
and he that seeketh findeth; and to
him that knocketh it shall be opened.

Matt. vii: 7-8.

He that rejecteth ME, and receiveth
not MY words, hath one that judgeth
him: the word that I have spoken,
the same shall judge him in the last
day.

John xii: 48.

For the Son of man is come to seek
and to save that which was lost.

Luke xix: 10.

I came not to call the righteous,
but sinners to repentance.

Luke v: 32.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THERE ARE MANY GOOD ARTICLES IN this issue of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, but we call special attention to that of our new contributor, "John Bond." His thoughtful presentation of Rome's "judicious flattery" in dealing with Americans, and his plea for the evangelization of the Roman Catholics, will be read with interest.

THERE ARE HUNDREDS OF SUBSCRIBERS on our list this year who have not helped in any way to pay the expenses connected with the publication of this magazine, though we hope they derive pleasure and profit from reading it. We would like very much to have them benefactors as well as beneficiaries of the work. The Summer is a dull season in mission and publication work, and at no time of the year is co operation more welcome.

LAST MONTH SEVERAL FRIENDS SENT us subscriptions for Roman Catholics at the rate of fifty cents a year. This is an excellent way of doing missionary work among them, and we hope our list of Roman Catholic readers will thus grow to be a large one. As to the benefit they will derive from reading it, we ask our readers to put themselves in the place of the Roman Catholics who read it every month, and they can judge what effect it will have on them. The harvest does not come immediately after the sowing of the seed. But if good seed be sown in good ground with God's blessing it will bring forth an abundant harvest.

SOME YEARS AGO THE SOCIETY KNOWN as the Ancient Order of Hibernians was in bad odor with the hierarchy in

the United States because there were some Irish Americans in the body who thought ecclesiastics should not meddle with secular affairs, but, like the Knights of Labor, the Hibernians have yielded to the threats of the bishops. At their annual meeting in New Orleans last month Bishop Foley of Detroit and several priests were appointed on the board of managers.

AS AN OFFSET TO THE GREAT ORGANIZATIONS of the Roman Catholic Church such as the Hibernians, Knights of Labor, etc., the patriotic workingmen of the United States are forming societies that are AMERICAN in the best sense. One powerful organization already numbers tens of thousands of the best men in several Western States; and there is every prospect that the Roman organizations that have controlled municipal and state elections and are now reaching out after the national government will be effectually met and conquered at the polls. With every patriotic American we bid the AMERICANS Godspeed.

THE REPORT OF THE PROGRESS OF THE work of Christ's Mission for the conversion of Roman Catholics for last year, the first year of the occupancy of the present building, that appeared in our last issue, has been published in a neat tract of 32 pages, with a sketch of the pastor's life and pictures of himself and wife. Copies for distribution can be had at this office.

We again invite the friends of this work to make Christ's Mission their home when they visit New York. There is ample accomodation, and we are sure they will be as comfortable as at a hotel, if not more so.

ROME INVADES THE UNITED STATES SENATE.

GOVERNOR FLOWER has signed the "Freedom of Worship" bill that virtually gives Roman Catholic priests control of every charitable, benevolent and reformatory institution in the State of New York that is supported even in part by public money. The reason assigned for the necessity of such a law is that as a majority of the inmates of those institutions are Roman Catholic the priests should have charge of them. The power of Rome in this State is now supreme. It only remains for that Church to grasp the National Government.

The day of the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church in this country is not so far distant as it may seem to some easy-going citizens. For the first time in the history of the United States the services for the dead prescribed by the ritual of the Roman Catholic Church were performed in the Senate Chamber on May 16 at the funeral of the late Senator John S. Barbour, of Virginia. It was conducted by Bishop Keane, rector of the Catholic University, and by a number of priests. Not only was such a service performed for the first time in the Senate Chamber, but it was also notable from the fact that the dead Senator was not a member of the Roman Catholic Church. Bishop Keane in his funeral oration said that in view of the fact that the late Mrs. Barbour was a Catholic the Senator's family requested that the prayers of the Church be read for him, and this request was granted.

The clerk's desk in the Senate Chamber was used as an altar, with a big crucifix, lighted candles, etc.,

and holy water and incense were freely used as in a Roman Catholic Church. There were present all the Senators, Congressmen, the Justices of the Supreme Court, in their black silk gowns, and the President's Cabinet (with the exception of that grand Christian, Postmaster-general Wanamaker).

In his sermon Bishop Keane said, "The Roman Catholic Church prayed for Senator Barbour because she regarded him as a catechumen, a candidate for baptism and full membership, though he had temporarily delayed the final step." That is, Senator Barbour probably said in the course of conversation with his wife, who was a Roman Catholic, "If I believed your Church to be true I would join it." On the strength of this, though he never professed any religion, he was buried as a Roman Catholic. Bishop Keane said further that the hoped this ceremony in the Senate Chamber would cement the "union of American statesmanship with the Roman Catholic faith, and that thereby the outcry of religious animosity, so out of place in this land of civil and religious liberty, might be forever hushed." By religious liberty Bishop Keane meant liberty for the spread of Romanism in the United States. "We claim liberty from you Protestants," says the Pope and his agents, "because it is your principle to grant it to all. We deny you liberty when we have the power, because that is our principle. We are the only true Church to which absolute obedience must be given. All out of it are condemned."

Never before in the history of this country was such an impression made on the representative public men at

Washington as by this ceremony over the remains of Senator Barbour. "Bishop Keane's sermon," says the New York *Herald*, May 17, "delivered in a round, sonorous voice and with all the graces and emotions of a great pulpit orator, was listened to with interest by the immense audience, comprising the most distinguished public men of the land." Who will say that Rome is not regaining in this country what she has lost in Europe?

In the Roman Catholic countries of Europe such a scene as that which took place at the funeral of Senator Barbour would not be tolerated. Well might the Pope say that his Church has more freedom and power in the United States than any other country, for no other nation would permit the priests of Rome to invade the assembly room of the highest legislative body with their mummeries. Bishop Keane, dressed in most gorgeous robes, we are told, had as his chief assistant the Jesuit, Father Gillespie, who sprinkled holy water over the body of Senator Barbour and waved the incense thurible that sent the pungent odor through the Senate Chamber. Even a colytes who bore lighted candles were dressed in fantastic costumes. There is no mistake or exaggeration in saying that Rome has captured the United States Senate.

Another Nun Leaves the Convent.

A dispatch from Rome, Italy, dated May 17, 1892, says:

"A nun named Ermelind has fled from the Convent of Santa Maria at Orta, near this city. Owing to a suspected love affair she had been ill-treated in the convent until she became incensed. She was assisted in

her flight by the pupils, and took refuge in the house of one of them. The ecclesiastical authorities have applied to the police to recapture the nun, but the police refuse to interfere in the matter."

A Liberal Catholic.

At the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Omaha, Nebraska, last month, Bishop Hurst said in reference to the new National University at Washington, that three-fourths of the contributions received came from Protestants who were not Methodists, "and \$10,000 from a Roman Catholic whose name I dare not mention." President Harrison warmly endorses this movement for a national Protestant University. The beloved Chaplain McCabe said if the rich will not endow it, a contribution of a penny a day from every communicant of the Methodist Church will raise \$10,000,000 in a year. The liberal Catholic who gave Bishop Hurst \$10,000 for this Protestant University has no faith in the Roman Church, though outwardly conforming to it. There are tens of thousands of such persons who are called Catholics because they do not know the Bible way of salvation. If they knew that they could come directly to Almighty God the Father through Jesus Christ, the only Mediator, they would cease to be Romanists. Christians should tell them of the way of the Lord.

A GREAT OFFER.

"The Converted Catholic" will be sent to new subscribers from the month of April 1892 to January 1893, for 50 cents. We hope our present subscribers will earnestly try to get one or two new names at this rate.

SERVICES IN CHRIST'S MISSION.

142 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, JAMES A. O'CONNOR, PASTOR.

Sabbath services are held at 3 p. m. and 7-45 p. m., the former a Bible class and conference, and the evening service devoted to Gospel preaching in opposition to the false, superstitious, unscriptural and dangerous doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. Prayer meeting, conference and lecture Thursday evenings at 8 o'clock. Roman Catholics especially invited. All welcome.

BESIDES the regular congregation that attends the services in Christ's Mission, there are always strange faces to be seen there. Protestants whose relatives by marriage are Roman Catholics frequently come to learn something that might help to win them to the truth. At the service on May 8, when the pastor preached on the wickedness and folly of the veneration—adoration, it should be called—of the wrist bone of the “grand-mother of God,” as the Canadian priests termed it, there were present some relatives of Dr. O'Reilly, who were shocked that a man of so much learning and culture should give countenance to such an imposture. In his intercourse with Protestants he poses as a liberal Catholic who would break down the barriers of prejudice that separate Protestant Christians from their Roman Catholic brethren, after the manner of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland. But when he is in the company of other priests he is as bigoted and superstitious as the rest of them. This is an old trick of Rome to throw dust in the eyes of Protestants. While those men are share-holders in the concern, deriving much profit from the superstitious traffic in masses, relics, etc., they should be avoided as deceivers and tricksters.

Besides the sermons of the pastor, who preached every Sunday last month,

there were several addresses by other brethren, converts from Rome and ministers of different denominations. The address of Mr. G. Maugeri, an Italian convert, who is now a student of Princeton Seminary, was a very clear and touching account of his conversion from Romanism and his hope and trust in Christ. He is an earnest, gifted brother, who will do good work as a missionary among his countrymen. Another Italian brother, Signor Cristini, who with Mr. Maugeri was the guest of Christ's Mission last month, has been recently converted and has already engaged in mission work in Hazleton, Pa. There is a growing interest in the evangelization of the Italians in this country, and the work is progressing.

The patriotic address of Rev. Dr. Mason Gallagher, chaplain of U. S. Grant Post of the Grand Army of the Republic, at one of the Sunday evening services in the Mission last month was so inspiring and hopeful that he promised to come soon again.

Sunday evening, May 22, the pastor preached a Gospel sermon that was beneficial to all, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, Protestant and Catholic. All must come unto God by Christ, and all who repent and have faith in Him can come. The preacher also spoke of the desecration of the United States Senate Chamber the previous week by Roman ecclesiastics at the funeral of Senator Barbour.

A BOGUS RELIC.

FOR three weeks last month a "sacred relic" was on exhibition in the French Canadian Church on Seventy-sixth street, New York, and 200,000 persons went to see it. They not only saw it, but, with few exceptions, they knelt down before it in veneration and worship and paid ten cents each for the privilege of kissing the glass case in which it was enclosed. Some paid more, but all were required to put at least ten cents in the money box that was placed at the side of the "relic."

This "relic" is said to be a fragment of the arm of St. Anne, the mother of the Virgin Mary, which was brought from Rome by Mgr. Marquis, of Quebec, and is to be placed in the Church of St. Anne de Beaupre, Montreal, where "miracles of healing" are performed every year on the feast of St. Anne. When Mgr. Marquis went to Rome at the beginning of this year the Pope gave him a letter to the Abbot of the Benedictine monastery in Rome to obtain a part of the arm of St. Anne that is preserved in the church. The monks say this arm has been in Rome for many years, but of course they give no dates, though they say, and the New York *Herald* endorses their statement, that the body of St. Anne was taken from Jerusalem to Constantinople in the year 710. What became of it afterwards is not known further than that there are pieces of it enshrined in churches and scattered all over the world. The report in the *Herald* said: "In the 'Revelations' of the great St. Bridget, who died in 1373, there is a striking passage connected with the relic. St. Bridget made a pilgrimage to Rome

and had the happiness of venerating the arm of St. Anne. That night St. Anne appeared to her and assured her that the arm was her own"! That's a good story for Bridget.

How the "relic" was obtained is told in the *Herald* as follows: "The prior of the monastery accompanied Mgr. Marquis to the spot where the relic is kept. In his attempt to saw off a piece of the arm the saw was broken, but Mgr. Marquis had a saw also, and he cut off as long a piece as he in decency could. It is one-half of the wrist, and to it the flesh and skin still adhere. The fragment is about three inches in length, and is enclosed in a little bronze casket with a glass cover. Around the relic is a piece of paper with this inscription: '*Ex Brachio S. Anne, M. B. M. V.*'—'From the arm of St. Anne, Mother of the blessed Virgin Mary.'"

"There before you," said Father Tetreau, the pastor of the church where the relic is exhibited, to the *Herald* reporter, "lies the bone of the forearm of her who clasped to her maternal bosom the Virgin Mary. Can we doubt that that arm also held the infant Jesus? I am proud to have such a relic to show to my people, and I am glad to know that a similar fragment of the arm of the blessed St. Anne is on its way from Rome for our own church." Father Tetreau has netted \$20,000 out of the present exhibition, and when his own relic arrives he expects to become a millionaire.

Mgr. Bernard O'Reilly, the author of the life of Pope Leo XIII. that proved such a literary and financial failure, though published by the house of which Mark Twain, the humorist,

is the principal stockholder, has professed his belief in the genuineness of the relic. He preached a sermon in the presence of the relic Sunday, May 8, when an admission fee of \$1.00 was paid by as many as could get into the church. "We have here to-night," said he, "a relic more sacred and precious than the seamless coat which Mary wore for the divine Jesus." [Alas! for the "Holy Coat of Treves" that netted \$2,000,000 for the Papal treasury last year.] "It is the very flesh which the mother of Mary gave to her, and which she gave to her Son, who died on the cross for the world's redemption. Do you understand me?" he continued with intense earnestness. "This brings you almost in communication with Jesus Christ. It is bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh. Ask me not what proof I have that it is the body of St. Anne. I will reply that God gives testimony that it is authentic by performing miracles with it." It is difficult to characterize such language. Words fail to express the disgust one feels in reading it.

"I have not time now," Dr. O'Reilly continued, "to tell you how the body of St. Anne came to reach Constantinople from Jerusalem, but it was taken there for safe keeping during the persecutions of the Jews, and afterwards was removed to the cathedral of Apt in France, where it remains to this day. An arm by direction of the Pope was removed to Rome."

Preaching again in the church where the relic was on exhibition Sunday evening, April 15, Dr. O'Reilly said, as reported next day in the *Herald*: "If the hand of Jesus could give sight to the blind and life to the dead, can He not with this arm of St. Anne cure

your bodies and heal your hearts?"

The church was packed to suffocation, says the reporter. The admission fee had been reduced to fifty cents. At the close of the sermon the benediction of the blessed sacrament occurred, that is, the people were blessed with the wafer which they believe to be the body and blood, soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, but they did not care much about that blessing, and no demonstration was made by them until Dr. O'Reilly took the relic in his hand and said he would bless them with it. "Then," said the *Herald*, "there was a movement in the congregation as if to fall on their knees, but Dr. O'Reilly told them not to do so, and holding aloft the relic he said in an impressive manner: 'May the blessing of the Virgin Mary and her mother St. Anne, and the multitude of angels and saints around the throne unite their supplications to mine and yours and bring down upon you from the hand and arm of St. Anne every blessing and grace you seek for.' It was well that he left the name of God out of the blessing," for He is the God who said, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in the heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them; for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments."

Those who bow down before that "relic" and pictures of the Virgin Mary and the saints cannot escape the condemnation of God, and do not keep His commandments when worshipping those things. It is a quibble and pretense of the Roman Catholics to say that they do not "worship" them. One of the greatest saints and doctors of their Church, Alphonsus Liguori, founder of the Redemptorists, says in his prayer to the Virgin Mary, which is found in page 285 of "The New Raccolta," or collection of prayers and good works, published in 1886 by order of Pope Leo XIII., "Most holy and immaculate Virgin! O my mother! thou who art the queen of the world, the *advocate, hope and refuge of sinners!* I the most wretched among them, come to thee. I WORSHIP THEE, great queen, and thank thee for the many favors thou hast bestowed on me; most of all, do I thank thee for having saved me from hell, which I had so often deserved. I love thee, lady most worthy of all love, and by the love which I bear for thee, I promise ever in the future to serve thee. In thee I put all my trust, all my hope of salvation." If that is not worship, pray, what is it? St. Liguori says: "O my mother, I worship thee!" Now let Dr. O'Reilly say to St. Anne, "O my grandmother, I worship the bone of thy wrist."

Day after day since the "relic" was first exhibited the New York *Herald* has given large space to booming it, but not until May 12 did it refer to the financial part of the exhibition. On that day it said: "The presence of the relic has been a great financial boon to the parish of St Jean Baptiste. The parish has been under rather

heavy expense lately in building the new school and college in Seventy-sixth street near the church. This building is five stories high and nearly completed."

Is It a Chicken Bone?

The New York *Times* of May 9 had the following report of Father O'Connor's address at the services in Christ's Mission, Sunday evening, May 8:

"While hundreds of the faithful were crowding into the little Canadian Church of St. Jean Baptiste on East Seventy-six street last evening to kiss the glass case in which an alleged fragment of one of St. Anne's arms is incased the Rev. James A. O'Connor, of Christ's Mission, 142 West Twenty-first street, was preaching to an attentive audience as to the fallacy of the relic.

"The *Times* on Friday last noticed the credulous interest that many Catholics were manifesting in their anxiety to get a glimpse of what they were assured was the bone of the arm of St. Anne, the mother of Mary, the mother of Christ. Thousands of persons have crowded into the little church to see the relic.

"As to its genuineness, the Rev. Mr. O'Connor, who for eight years was a Roman Catholic priest, gave his opinion last night. The text of his sermon was 'Relics,' with special reference to the fragmentary arm bone which Father Tetreau is exhibiting to his flock and the public by the courtesy of Mgr. Marquis of Quebec, who is on his way home from Rome, where he got the sacred relic.

"Mr. O'Connor told his listeners that he had paid two visits to the church to see and examine the relic.

'I examined it,' said he, 'as closely as I could through the glass case. I do not hesitate to say that this "relic" resembles more a chicken bone and the down on it incipient feathers than it does a human bone or human hair.

"I asked the priest who was exhibiting the relic what his idea was as to the personality of St Anne, and he said she was the grandmother of God. Now, all trace of St. Ann's remains was lost sight of for 700 years, when, it is claimed, they were discovered in Constantinople.

"This relic, now on exhibition in St. Jean Baptiste Church, is an imposition on the people. There are no fragments of the remains of St. Anne extant. This bone is a bogus one, a rank imposition, placed on exhibition for revenue only, and if the revenue was not forthcoming the exhibition would cease.

"I stood there beside the priest and watched the people as they came in to kiss the holy relic. About eighteen inches from where the priest sat is a small box on which is the plain sign, "Put 10 cents in the box and then light a candle." The poor deluded people not only put the dimes in, but many much more. I dare say the exhibition will net upward of \$20,000 for the priests.

"There is supposed to be a sacred relic in every Catholic altar stone, but this is the first time in the United States that one has ever been exhibited for money. It is a disgraceful, shameful traffic in what is supposed to be a sacred relic. It may safely be predicted that as this exhibition has paid so well it will not be the last, and other priests will begin to exhibit their relics or get some imported, whereby to in-

crease the devotion of the faithful—and the revenues of the church. Such a thing is worse than profanation."

* *

From the report in the New York *Advertiser* of the same date these additional sentences are gleaned:

"Father O'Connor said he had been to the church and saw hundreds flock to throw themselves in adoration before a piece of bone and hair. One priest had told him that the relic was a portion of the wrist of the 'Grandmother of God.' He had seen the relic, and he could only say that it looked like the bone of a chicken. Intelligent Catholic American priests, Mr. O'Connor added, laughed at the thing. Not one of them could be found to stand up and declare that it was in reality a portion of the bone of St. Anne.

"Mr. O'Connor said he talked with Father Tetreau and obtained his views on the matter. Father Tetreau had said that in the relic itself there was no virtue, the people did not adore it, but simply bestowed on it that veneration which a portion of Washington's body would likely call forth from his countrymen were it exhibited, and which impels men to make a pilgrimage to Mount Vernon. The speaker added that even veneration for a relic of Washington would not impel people to fall on their knees and worship it. This exhibition, he said, was similar to the monstrosity of the holy coat of Treves, and to the 'six heads of St. Peter,' which, he stated, were said to be extant. Father O'Connor blamed the priests for being responsible for such absurdities, disgusting to all persons who really value and prize religion."

 CONVERTS FROM ROME.

IN our next issue we shall publish Rev. Dr. O'Shea's reasons for leaving the Franciscan Order and renouncing the faith of Rome that appeared in Father Connellan's paper, *The Catholic*, for May. We continue to receive many letters from converts from Rome, and they give us great joy even while the priests and their papers are grinning at us and calling us bad names. A postal card reached us through the mail last month with the following address:

"REV. FATHER O'CONNOR,
"Mission to the Catholics,
"New York City."

It was doubtless first taken to Archbishop Corrigan, who said it was for none of his priests, but for a very bad man named O'Connor. We shall send him a copy of this month's magazine, and we suppose he will make an ugly face, which he always has ready for use, at the following letters from converted Catholics:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, April 9, 1892.

DEAR SIR:—I send you my subscription to *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* for 1892. I am a convert from the Roman Catholic Church. I was for fifty years in darkness, but now I praise God for the light, peace and glory that has come to my soul.

Yours in Christ, MRS. M. A. T.

—
OGDENSBURG, N. Y., April 4, 1892.

DEAR SIR:—One of your subscribers gave me a copy of *THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC* and asked me to read it and give my experience. I was brought up in the Roman Catholic faith. When I was fifteen years of age I lost confidence in that Church. For a

long time I felt there was a great distance between God and my soul. Thanks be to His grace! I was led to attend a Methodist church about a year ago. When the invitation was given to sinners to come to Jesus my sister and I fairly ran to the altar. I felt my need of a Saviour, and when I laid down my load of sin at the foot of the cross, peace like a river flowed through my soul. Jesus revealed himself to me as my personal Saviour. Everything on earth seemed to be filled with the glory of God. I knew I had been redeemed and washed in the blood of the Lamb. My heart longs for the salvation of those who are still in the darkness of Romanism. May God have mercy upon them and let His light shine upon their hearts, and may He bless you abundantly in your work of love. MRS. V. L.

—
This lady's twin sister writes:

DEAR SIR:—I will join with my sister in giving my experience and testimony for Jesus. When I was nine years old I attended a sisters' school for one year. I was a great sinner, and behaved worse than I ever did before. I suppose it was because I was so near to the priest. My family moved to the country before I was old enough to go to confession. I had to go to them with all my sins, but I think I repented of them more truly than if I had confessed them to a priest. In this place, Ogdensburg, I was thrown among Protestants. A Baptist family invited me to go to Sunday school with them. My mother consented, but told me not to believe anything they taught, as there

was only one true religion—the Roman Catholic. They were so kind to me; their love was stamped on my heart, and I thought them the best people in the world. I married a Methodist. At times God's Spirit strove with me in a powerful manner. Once in particular I could not rest. I told my husband how my sins oppressed me, and we prayed together, and I obtained some relief. Then I attended a ball and lost my sense of peace. I lived thus until February 18, 1891, when my sister and I knelt at Jesus' feet and found rest to our souls. The way is peaceful. I am trusting Him alone. Oh! how I wish that those in the bondage of Rome might come to the light. My prayer is that God may wonderfully bless and help you in all your labors. MRS. M. T.

ST. PAUL, MINN., May 2, 1892.

DEAR BROTHER:—I believe the Lord would have me write you the good news of the conversion of the young Roman Catholic girl of whom I wrote you some time ago. She now rejoices that she is a Protestant, though being a Protestant would not save her any more than being a Catholic, if she did not know that her name is written in the Lamb's book of Life. I never saw so clearly before the truth of the Word proven—"In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth." (Eph. 1: 13). Roman Catholics must hear the Word of God before they can believe, and when they are born again it is indeed by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible—by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." (1 Peter 1: 23.)

This young lady came to our mission last fall with her sister, who was also saved from Romanism three years ago. When the invitation was given for all those who wished to be Christians to rise, she arose. I talked and prayed with her, and although she was willing to accept Christ as her Saviour she seemed to have no idea of the way. I don't suppose she had ever heard of the finished work of Christ before. Calling to see her one day at her home I was told she had gone for a few months to stay with her sister. I said, Praise the Lord. This is God's way of leading her into the light. The seed needs to be sown, that is all. She returned last week, and came to see me, and the growth and knowledge she had acquired astonished me. She took her Bible to the Catholic Church with her, and received some persecution for doing so. She told them that church was the place to take a Bible, and she would take it and read it. They raised objections because it was King James' version, so I gave her the Douay Testament for her mother, in hopes they would read that, which contains the same precious words of life. She went with me to the mission last evening and definitely took a stand for Christ. She has very bitter opposition, but is very strong and firm for a girl so recently converted.

This young lady's sister writes me: "I always thought I was pretty good and all right if I went to confession once in a while; but I was not going long to Sunday school before one of the lessons, entitled, 'Who can forgive sins but God only?' set me thinking and led me to Christ."

Yours very sincerely, L. H. M.

MY CONVERSION AND EXPERIENCE.

BY REV. W. HODNETT, MONTANA.

HITHERTO I have studiously avoided any reference to my connection with the Roman Church, and if I recur to it now it is in the hope that my sad and bitter experience will be useful to others. I have always regarded it as one of the misfortunes of my life to have been born and trained a Romanist. I am, however, thankful to the Divine Father that in His own good time I was shown the way out, nay, more, saved by divine grace and led into the fold of the good Shepherd. It occurred thus :

I left home when under nineteen years of age, and became associated in England with some of my old school fellows and others. We were all at that time zealous Romanists together. I had, or at least was supposed by them to have some measure of education, and was therefore trusted to defend the principles and practices of our common faith from the attacks of the Protestants. Some kind Christian people tried to show us better than we knew, but we always jealously regarded their attempts as assaults ; for did we not belong to the only true Church? Unfortunately for the Catholic youth, he is not good at defending his faith ; positively he does not know the meaning of the word. He has some vague idea of some virtue or power or infallibility somewhere in some undefined form, but does not know the one infallible fountain, the simple, saving Word of God. Nor is he so much to blame either, for has he not always been told that the Scriptures are difficult to understand, and therefore improper and dangerous

for the common people ?

I got ashamed of my unfortunate ignorance, and not wishing to appear too stupid, I procured a copy of the Douay Testament and read it, and in company with a dear friend, himself only recently a convert from Rome, read chapter after chapter and book after book in both the Douay and authorized versions, and we were greatly pleased with the discovery that there was not after all any very great difference between them. Those unfortunate foot notes which Rome will not leave out make the greatest difference.

This kind of work went on for almost two years. I was obliged to mingle with Protestants, and the question of religion would come up. It was no good quoting from the "fathers ;" these people would only listen to the grand fathers or the men of the Bible. And besides there had by this time arisen a thirst for truth in my own heart. I went to mass, to confession, and, strange to say, went even to Protestant meetings sometimes, which spoiled it all.

At the end of two years I was strong enough in the strength that grace supplieth, and willing enough to cast off the bondage of the past and break with Rome once and forever. The priests know full well that when a man leaves their fold it is not to return, and then if they can make any trouble for him they rarely fail to do so. Fortunately for me, there were not many Roman Catholics in that part of England, but the few that were to be found there showed as much as they could the old spirit. They talked

a good deal, of course, and had it been possible for them they would have done much more. A party of them came one evening to my lodgings, and they seemed quarrelsome. I retired from them and learned afterwards that they had intended to kill me. After I became a "heretic" they stole my prayer book—the "Garden of the Soul"—and my Douay Bible. I hope they made good use of the latter.

After a while my Protestant friends, possibly more zealous than wise, would have me preach. This, of course, was more annoying to my former associates. I have heard them pouring the vilest curses on my head; some of them in the Irish language under the mistaken impression that I did not understand them.

On one fine Sabbath afternoon in the west of Cornwall, England, and in the open air, I was doing my humble best to preach God's simple truth to a large congregation. I have always taken care not to be abusive to Roman Catholics. They are not to blame. It is the system of Rome. There were several of them among my listeners on this occasion, and they showed considerable restiveness and appeared determined to do something desperate. I saw them gathering stones, and then passing through the crowd they placed themselves, thus armed, between me and my home. My congregation also observed the movement of these Romanists, and without a word, or even a hint, from me they formed an orderly procession and guarded me to my home. This and many other things which they attempted towards me became known abroad, and the magistrates and gentlemen of the neighborhood simply notified the priest

and his leading men that actions of that kind must cease. In spite of rumors to the contrary the heart of the English people is against any interference with its liberty on the part of Rome.

The report of our leaving the Roman Church was sent or carried to Ireland, and as the priests there could not get at us (my brother, my friend and myself) they must vent their wrath any way and abuse and annoy our dear friends at home. Such conduct is cowardly and characteristic of them.

Tired of this constant scolding our good mother dispatched our dear father to England to bring us back to the faith or, failing in that, to burn the house about us. The old gentleman came over to see us. Of course we knew nothing of the alternative to burn our house, or we might have been more cautious. But he did not burn anything, dear old man, or say a great deal either to his refractory boys. I put the matter before him thus: "My dear father, which is the man likely to put the truth before you—the priest who has an interest in keeping you where you are, or I, who have no interest, and cannot have any, save that prompted by affection and love." My dear father went back to Ireland feeling that he would like to be delivered from the old Church, though to change the opinion of the old is difficult. But, as he phrased it, "they would destroy everything I have; I could not live there." Rome is a cruel tyrant, and makes every man a tyrant also in his way. Rome will trample on natural affection or on any of the most sacred rights of men or nations offering any opposition to her sway. That is her history everywhere.

FATHER CHINIQUY'S DECLARATION.

FATHER CHINIQUY has been recently ill at his home in St. Anne, Ill., and a surgical operation was necessary to restore him to health. As he is eighty-three years old the surgeons did not know what the issue would be, and to guard against all accidents the venerable champion of the faith of the Bible against the false doctrines of Rome set his house in order by dictating to Rev. P. Boudreau, pastor of the Presbyterian church at St. Anne, and signing the following document :

"At this solemn moment, when the surgeons are about to perform an operation which may send me to my grave or bring me back to health, I have a duty to fulfil toward the Christian Church which so kindly received me in 1858.

"If it is the will of God to call me to himself, I leave this life with joy, for I can hear all the echoes of heaven and earth repeat the words of my Saviour—'I go to my Father to prepare a place for you, that where I am ye may be also.'

"I know that on the cross He paid my debt and that He obtained my pardon; that He has destroyed with His own hands the condemnation which I deserved for my many sins. My trust is in Him, and Him alone. He is my only hope, my only joy, and my eternal light. It is He alone who has secured a place for me in the eternal kingdom of His Father. I bless Him to-day more than ever that He has opened my eyes to the errors, superstitions and idols of the Church of Rome, in which I was born, in which I had been a priest for more than twenty-five years.

"As it is most probable the priests of Rome will do for me what they did for so many others, and will publish that I made my peace with the Church of Rome before dying—I protest in advance against this new calumny. With the grave facing me, I invite more than ever my fellow-countrymen and all Roman Catholics to break the heavy yoke that the Church of Rome puts upon the nations which she blinds and keeps as poor slaves at the feet of her idols. The Roman priests deceive the people in making them believe that they have the power to change the wafer into our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. The wafer is only a powerless idol. The mass is only a tissue of blasphemies and idolatries; the priest lifting up the wafer and saying to the people, 'This is your god who has saved you on the cross,' only performs the same act of idolatry that Aaron did when he said to Israel in showing the golden calf, 'Here is your God who leads you out of Egypt.'

"The auricular confession is a trap into which the majority of priests fall with their followers. The confessional is an invention of Satan given to the Church of Rome by the idolaters of ancient times.

"I forgive with all my heart all the calumnies that my enemies have said or written against me. I thank and bless the brothers and sisters in Jesus Christ who have helped me through my trials through which I have had to pass since I left the Church of Rome. I ask pardon of God and man for the faults committed during my life. My soul has heard the voice which said, 'I will come soon,' and has answered, 'Come, Lord Jesus, come.'

"C. CHINIQUY."

THE FARIBAULT SCHOOL QUESTION APPROVED.

LAST month we gave the full history of the Faribault and Stillwater experiments of uniting the public and parochial schools inaugurated by Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul, Minn. It was the most complete summary of the case yet published, and we are pleased that it has been copied by several papers. "The Congregational Minister" who wrote that article has a brilliant pen that we are happy to say will be used regularly in these pages.

The Faribault plan has been now formally approved by the Pope, and it will be extended wherever practicable—that is, in every city and town in the United States where the Roman Catholic priests can compel the American people to pay for the education of children in purely Roman Catholic schools. That is the gist of the matter. The priests will lease their school buildings to the city authorities for a dollar a year and demand that the nuns or sisters shall be paid the same as other school teachers. The Roman Catholic "religion" will not be taught directly by the nuns during school hours, but indirectly it will be taught all day long in its fulness as long as the children can stand it. The school books, and especially histories, will be compiled under the supervision of the bishops and priests, that nothing offensive to them shall be taught. This supervision is to extend not only over the books used by the children of the Roman Church, but it must embrace all books used in the public schools by the children of Protestant, Jewish and agnostic parents. The truth of history will be suppressed or distorted to suit the hierarchy. If the

American people like this kind of "union" with Rome they are going to have it. The Jesuits do not like the plan, as they think it is secularizing the parochial schools, and they are sustained by Archbishop Corrigan and a majority of the bishops and priests.

At the dinner that followed the consecration of Dr. Gabriels as bishop of Ogdensburgh, N. Y., in Albany last month Archbishop Corrigan triumphantly waved a cablegram from Rome which read, "Faribault plan condemned; can be tolerated in special cases" When the press conveyed this intelligence to the friends of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, who favor the plan, and in the interest of which the latter has been in Rome for the last four months, they sent to the press a letter from Archbishop Ireland to Father Byrne, one of his priests, in which he said: "The good Pope has been most loving towards me. The so called Faribault plan is now formally allowed in spite of Germans and Jesuits. The decision is: 'Tolerari potest,' which means canonically, 'Is fully allowed.' A letter addressed to me in the name of the Propaganda brings out the full practical meaning of the words and imply a full approval." The Propaganda letter was also published, as was the following official document from Rome:

"In special Congregation of the Propaganda, held on the 21st of April, 1892, to consider the question what judgment is to be formed of the arrangement entered into by Archbishop Ireland concerning the two schools at Faribault and Stillwater, Minn.; in this case they decided to reply affirma-

tively and without derogating from the decree of the Councils of Baltimore on parochial schools, that the arrangement entered into by Archbishop Ireland concerning the schools at Fari-bault and Stillwater, taking into consideration all the circumstances, can be tolerated.

"In an audience held the same day his holiness deigned to approve the resolution of the cardinals given above.

"IGNATIUS,

"Archbishop of Damata, Secretary."

In the letter of the Propaganda to Archbishop Ireland, Cardinal Ledochowski, the prefect, said the archbishop's presentation of the question of the union of the parochial and public schools was "worthy of every praise," and the Roman authorities were pleased that he "has always wished to maintain inviolable the principles set forth by the Holy See and commended to the observance of the bishops by the Councils of Baltimore, particularly the Third Council." Then follows this Jesuitical declaration: "I hope your grace will be gratified by this decision of the Holy See, because, though unusual provisions made by the different bishops in their respective dioceses according to the requirement of circumstances cannot be approved directly by the Holy See when they imply a departure, to a certain extent, from a general law, nevertheless, when the Holy See declares that such provisions may be tolerated, it thereby puts an end to all indiscreet attacks upon them." This means that the general law of the Roman Church in the United States that requires separate schools for Roman Catholics may be set aside wherever the bishops and priests can get the American people to

support them as "union schools."

The confidence of the Pope in Archbishop Ireland is declared in the closing sentence of the letter: "Furthermore, by order of his holiness and with great pleasure to myself, I must not fail to inform your grace that your expressions of respect, filial obedience and unalterable adherence to the Holy See and its teachings, of which you have given splendid proofs, have been most acceptable to the Sovereign Pontiff and myself, and have strengthened the full confidence of the Holy See in your wisdom and piety."

Archbishop Ireland poses as an American with liberal ideas, but he has assured the Pope that he is as loyal a Romanist as Archbishop Corrigan or any Jesuit, and that he is working solely for the good of his Church and not in the interests of the public schools of America. Every American should bear this in mind and keep well informed on the controversy that is sure to follow this decision of the Pope. The school question is going to be as formidable an issue in the political life of this country as the slavery question was, and it may have to be settled in the same way.

— — — — —
WE HAVE ALREADY NOTICED TWO excellent pamphlets on the school question and we again commend them to our readers. They are "Two Sides of the School Question," as set forth at the annual meeting of the National Educational Association in 1889, by Cardinal Gibbons and Bishop Keane on the one hand, and the Hon. John Jay and Edwin D. Mead on the other; and "The Parochial School Question" by an Irish Catholic Layman. Price 10 cents each. Address this office.

MONTHLY RECORD OF ROMAN CATHOLIC EVENTS.

THE Cleveland (Ohio) *Catholic Knight*, April 30, 1892, gives us the following information: "In some places in Texas, in Bishop Brennan's diocese, Catholics go twenty miles to mass. Theirs is the faith which shall avail them unto life everlasting."

Alas! No. This standard of piety is false in every way. A man may walk fifty miles to go to church and not be the better for it. True piety is not a form, Roman Catholic or otherwise, but a state of the heart. We have to look out for what Paul denounced so strongly when he spoke of those "holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof." (2 Tim. 3: 5.)

The Montreal French Roman Catholic papers published the following dispatch dated April 24, 1892:

"Yesterday the Emperor of Austria received the primate of Hungary, Archbishop Vassary, returning from the Vatican, where he had been to ask the Pope to condemn the antisemitic agitation. The Pope promised only to submit the question to the College of Cardinals, saying that he could not act himself in a direct manner, and that he wished to avoid quarrels between Church and State."

This is a very interesting item of news. Here is one of the most important questions of the day, involving both moral and political interests—the persecution of the Jews in Europe. No doubt it affects morality as well as politics or political economy. And a Pope, who claims to be infallible in all matters pertaining to faith and

morals, comes and tells an archbishop asking him to settle the question, that he, an infallible Pope, cannot act directly, but must ask the cardinals about it! The secret of the Pope's attitude is not a secret at all. He is afraid to displease Germany and Russia, and he prefers to court their favor rather than assert his infallibility.

The last Quebec elections have shown once more the intrigues of the Roman clergy in political affairs. Some liberal and Roman Catholic papers have roundly denounced the conservative priests and bishops who have taken an active part in the contest. A Quebec daily, *Le Matin*, has claimed that the clergy has always been the friend of science and education, to which a liberal organ, the *Echo*, published at St. Scholastica, near Montreal, made this reply in its issue of April 24, 1892:

"The *Matin* says that in all times our Roman Catholic clergy have worked for the advancement of science and education. Please prove it. Till then we will remind you of those days of darkness when the priests taught from the pulpit that when one knew his catechism he was learned enough."

That paper is a Roman Catholic organ, and its utterances show that the Province of Quebec feels more bitterly the degradation of the Roman yoke than some may think.

Our ritualistic brethren who seek to conciliate Rome would do well to read an article published in the *Catholic Review* of February 27, 1892, by a graduate of Oxford and a Roman

Catholic under the heading, "The Position of Dissenters in England." He thus concludes his article :

"I have many friends among dissenters ; and I must say that, for that true liberality which hates to misapprehend another's faith, they are conspicuous among all shades of English Protestants."

And yet the ritualists think they are the nearest to Rome in practice and sympathy.

**

To say anything against Roman Catholic persons or things is a dangerous proceeding in this country. Here is what I find in the same paper, April 23, 1892 : "Captain R. H. Pratt has not yet been dismissed from the army, although the President must be aware of the unjustifiable and malicious attack that officer made on the Catholic Church."

Captain Pratt may be a good or a bad officer of the army. He may have been right or wrong in his management of the Indian school intrusted to his care. But this matters very little ; he has said something against Rome ; therefore he must go. "Now, therefore be wise . . . and be instructed."

**

The same issue has this to say about the World's Fair, though the Pope blessed it, which is enough to make a failure of it :

"Hon. Benjamin Butterworth is no longer connected with the Columbian exposition, but his spirit goes marching on. For instance, in the allegorical parade which will inaugurate the Fair twenty-four floats will be used to illustrate the development of civilization. Of these no less than four will be devoted to the glorification of the

first Protestant settlers, viz: English cavaliers and the settlement of Jamestown ; Hendrik Hudson ; Discovery of the Hudson River ; Dutch settlement of New Amsterdam ; Landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock ; Illustration of early Puritan life.

"But not one float will tell of the coming of the Catholics to Maryland, and of the proclamation of religious liberty by the followers of Lord Baltimore. So far as the Benjamin Butterworths still on the executive committee of the celebration can prevent us, we Catholics will not be in it. All the more reason is there why we should have a celebration of our own, in which the religion of Columbus, De Soto, Marquette, La Salle, Lord Calvert, Charles Carroll, Lafayette and the legion of other Catholic explorers, missionaries and patriots will not be ignored."

If what the *Catholic Review* calls Roman Catholic events has no representation in the above described parade, it is certainly the fault of the Roman Catholics. From the beginning they showed only apathy for the celebration, and they are just beginning to wake up. It is very amusing to see so many repetitions of the religious liberty myth. Lord Baltimore, the Roman Catholic subject of a Protestant country granted permission to settle in America by a Protestant government, could not, by any means, exclude Protestants from his colony. This is how he became the herald of religious liberty in America.

**

Father Eager recently preached in Liverpool on the theme, "May Catholics Read the Bible?" says the *Catholic Knight* of April 2, 1892.

Among other things he said these: "Besides this 'written' (i. e. the Bible) there was also the 'unwritten word' of God, and both, according to the decree of the Council of Trent, must be received with equal reverence amongst Christians. The history and structure of the Bible attest the truth of the Catholic tenet." He said also that "Catholics cannot interpret (the Bible) contrary to the Church's decision or the 'unanimous consent of the fathers' without shipwreck to their faith," which means that if a Roman Catholic uses his reason in reading the Bible he can no longer remain in the Roman Church. The good fathers don't exactly mean this, but they endeavored to prove too much, and logic is a dangerous thing with which to wrestle.

Not satisfied with having their own parochial schools our Roman Catholic friends would like also to annex to them the public schools. Are we exaggerating? Well, if you think so, just read this little sentence found among the editorial utterances of the Cleveland (Ohio) *Catholic Universe*, April 7, 1892: "It now appears to us that the key to the school question is this—Catholics must demonstrate that they, too, own the public schools." But there is many a slip betwixt the cup and the lip.

The assertion that Roman Catholics are not free to speak, think, act and write as they choose is based upon Roman Catholic claims and enactments. The *Catholic Review*, April 2, 1892, contains these plain statements with reference to the matter:

"One of the marks of a good Ca-

tholic is obedience to the bishops within the limits of their jurisdiction. The rulers of the Church are the judges to determine what is expedient, profitable or opportune.

"In all great questions affecting the interests of the Church, it is for the bishops to say what the Catholic position shall be. To guide them they have the Holy Ghost and the grace of their office. They are the leaders of the cause, and it is theirs to map out the plan of campaign, to survey the field, to mark the lines and to direct the combat. It is no function of the laity to supervise their official actions, or to subject them to trial by newspaper."

A new ministerial association, including Protestant clergymen and Roman Catholic priests, has been recently formed in St. Paul, Minn. Its object is united action for the sake of morality and temperance. There is, however, a curious feature of the association which is thus mentioned and commented upon by the *Northwestern Congregationalist*: "But a ministers' association from which prayer must be banished lest its form should offend some weak brother, is a novelty, to say the least."

The weak brother is the Roman Catholic priest, or, rather, priests. What a self-inflicted condemnation for the Roman Church! She who claims to be so liberal, so broad minded, so full of love for the erring brethren; who claims to be the mother of true devotion, will not allow her children to hear a prayer offered to the same God and the same Saviour, lest it should endanger their faith! What kind of a faith is this, that it should be

liable to suffer shipwreck or scandal through prayers offered to God? Such a beginning is not a very auspicious one for a clergymen's association.

* * *

The Boston *Pilot* has not improved much under the editorship of Patrick Donahue and James Jeffrey Roche, if we judge by this item which appeared in its issue of March 19, 1892:

"'INQUIRER,' Boston, is informed that the initials 'Y. W. C. T. U.' stand for 'Young Women's Christian Temperance Union,' the body which opposed State aid to a great charitable institution last week. The Y. W. C. T. U. is so called because its members are not young, nor womanly, nor Christian, nor united in anything but the bonds of bigotry." J. A. D.

* * *

Flattering the Priests.

The ladies of the temperance organizations who flatter the Romanists will not relish the above fling of the *Pilot*, which the New York *Independent* pronounces the leading Roman Catholic journal in this country. Our valued contributor, J. A. D., calls attention to it, but omits to say that Miss Willard and her co-workers never miss an opportunity to speak well of the Roman Catholic Church, and they never refer to the fact that nine tenths of the saloon-keepers in the United States are the most honored members of that Church. It is an amiable trait of character to speak well of all persons, and those ladies set the Roman Catholics a good example in this respect. But there is such a thing as too much toleration of error and evil. Those Protestants who praise the Roman Church must not be surprised when their relatives become Romanists. Lady Henry Somerset

has been before the American public recently as a leader in the temperance cause in England, and not until her departure was it known that her mother, Lady Somers, had been received into the Roman Catholic Church. Like Mr. Blaine, the Secretary of State, whose mother was a Roman Catholic, Lady Henry Somerset cannot be expected to say anything but what is good of the present religion of her mother.

Some years ago one of the prominent priests of Wisconsin, Father George L. Willard, was rather proud of his relationship to Miss Willard. After leaving Wisconsin he became vicar general of Dakota, and died at Banning, California, July 24, 1890.

It seems to be a mania with certain temperance workers to fawn upon and flatter the Roman Catholic priests who say they are in favor of temperance. But if those priests were sincere in their adherence to the cause of temperance they would first practise it and then withdraw from their intimate association with rum-sellers. The leading brewers and liquor dealers of New York are intimate friends of Archbishop Corrigan and his priests.

— — —

Can Corrigan Be Cardinal?

The Pope is a wise old man. To console the Jesuits and Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, for their grief at the endorsement of the "secularization" of the parochial schools, he may make the latter a Cardinal. The New York *Tribune* is booming Corrigan at a great rate for the red hat.

On March 28 it published a laudatory sketch and picture of the "little Archbishop," as Father McGlynn calls him, in which it is said: "In many

things Archbishop Corrigan is unconsciously deceptive, and his disposition is secretive. He has few confidants, perhaps none." That is a mistake. The Jesuits are his confidants, but they are as secretive as he is. The *Tribune* continues: "It required some courage to enter the McGlynn struggle and carry it to a successful issue. Dr. McGlynn was an easy man to overthrow if he had stood alone. His two most prominent gifts were a large heart and an eloquent tongue. But he was the scapegoat and representative of a party which for fifty years had flourished in New York and given discomfort to the bishops. It was reserved for Archbishop Corrigan to destroy that party, first by dismissing Dr. McGlynn, and then by routing Dr. Burtzell in the Roman courts and banishing him to the mountains. To accomplish this he had to face distrust in Rome, which dreads warfare of this kind, and opposition from a few powerful prelates at home. Nevertheless he went into the contest and carried it to a triumphant issue."

The *Tribune* fails to note that Corrigan is very rich and had the support of the Jesuits here and at Rome, where the head of the order is known as the "Black Pope" to distinguish him from the reigning pontiff who dresses in white. Money and intrigue can carry to a triumphant issue any cause in the Roman court, and everyone knows that the General of the Jesuits has more power in directing the policy of the Roman Church than even the Pope himself. If Archbishop Ireland has gained a victory in Rome over the Jesuits it is because there is at present no general of the order to direct its affairs. The successor of

Father Anderledy, who died a few months ago, will be chosen this month, and in view of the interregnum in the government of the famous society Archbishop Ireland's visit to Rome was well timed.

* * *

The *Tribune* in its issue of May 18 again refers to the rumors of the elevation of Archbishop Corrigan to the cardinalate. As he was too young when Cardinal McCloskey died he recommended Archbishop Gibbons for the red hat, for which he was afterwards sorry, as Gibbons has opposed Corrigan in the policy of the Church in this country. "But since that time," says the *Tribune*, "the conservative prelate of New York has had opportunities to show his metal to an extent which the world will never know. His course has met strong commendation at Rome. He is at this moment the representative of the party opposed to compromise in education, and he has the bishops of his province and of New England in his support." But the *Tribune* forgets that Corrigan is the son of a saloon-keeper who made much money by selling that brand of whisky known as "Jersey Lightning," and who was indicted several times by the Newark Grand Jury for violation of the excise law. The son of such a man may wear a dozen red hats, but he can never be respected by priests who respect themselves. It is well known to the *Tribune* writer and every other journalist in New York that the priests of the city do not conceal their contempt for Archbishop Corrigan, though they have to go on their knees and kiss his hand when they transact any business with him.

WHY THE ROMAN CHURCH FLATTERS AMERICANS.

BY JOHN BOND.

I.

UNIFORMITY of doctrine and uniformity of practice form, according to the claims of the Roman Church, one of the four visible and distinguishing marks which God has set upon her to help human souls in search of salvation toward recognizing the divine origin and apostolic mission of "Christ's bride upon earth." There is no more available argument in the arsenal of Romanism. It is heard from the lips of the young priest who still struggles to master the Latin of his Breviary; it is addressed to the faithful by the aged missionary father; it occurs again and again in the popular controversial writings of the Roman Church. "Look at our language," they say. "Look at our doctrine and our traditions. How old, how venerable! Then look at the multitudinous sects of Protestantism; observe the changes to which the Reformed faith has been subjected. Do you then fail to recognize in us the true and sole inheritors of Christianity?" It would be incompatible with the scope of this article to debate the question whether this uniformity of doctrine and practice has been a substantial, provable fact in the past.

No Roman apologist with the great historic events of his Church before his mind will care to go into details on this point, and no one but the very ignorant will believe that the faith of the Christian of early history was practically the same which the Roman Catholic of to-day is supposed to possess.

The question of whether the Roman Church is at this time uniform in its

doctrine, its practice, its customs and its views on political government is one which deserves the sincere and earnest attention of Americans. Never before in its remarkable history has the Church of Rome flattered a nation of heretics. That is altogether against her practice; it conflicts with the traditions of the *auto da fe*; it seems incompatible with her doctrine. Yet it is undeniable that Rome's policy toward the United States is one of judicious flattery. She is anxious to pose as the friend of America. Her "visible head" speaks words of praise and encouragement for the World's Fair. One of her cardinals protests his patriotism and the patriotism of Roman Catholics in numerous articles which the foremost literary and political magazines of the country are glad to publish. One of her archbishops never tires of professing his unreserved loyalty to American institutions, and is always ready to encourage American patriotism in his co-religionists. While the Church of Rome has ever been, and still is, the uncompromising enemy of Protestant Christianity wherever she possesses influence and power, it suits her policy to profess a genuine spirit of liberty and toleration in a Protestant Republic. In the capital of decaying Austria she invokes the power of the police to prevent Methodists from worshipping God according to the dictates of their conscience. In the National Capital of America "the Cardinal" protests at a public dinner her devotion to religious tolerance. In the Third Plenary Council at Baltimore she ad-

monishes the liquor sellers to give up their business and "seek a more decent way of earning a living." In European countries and in the great cities of this Union her support comes largely out of the liquor traffic. In certain parts of Germany her own monks engage in the brewing and selling of beer. In New York the Roman Catholic priests petition the Legislature against open saloons on Sunday. In the countries of Europe the priest himself is one of the best customers of the public house on the Sabbath day.

This deception does not impose on the Catholics themselves. For while the Church on the one hand makes a grand appeal to Americans, she is careful, on the other hand, to lend her assistance to every effort toward maintaining and perpetuating foreign ideas, foreign customs and foreign languages wherever it helps her to preserve the Roman faith among certain immigrants. Every seminarian in the first year of his theology knows exactly what the Church really means by her profession of loyalty to the Constitution and advocacy of temperance and Sunday closing. One of the first doctrines, which is strongly impressed upon the candidate for the priesthood, is the doctrine of mental reservation. He knows that it is not only lawful, but absolutely meritorious to deceive, if by deceiving a good end may be accomplished. Of the quality of goodness in such cases the Church is the sole judge. To deceive in a good cause, the Church says, is not deception in reality. It is called so by the world, but then the world never knew what was good and what was not good for the soul. The world concerns itself with things tem-

poral. The Church is the custodian of human souls, and therefore it takes precedence of the world and of the government even as the soul must be admitted to be superior to the body.

But while the deception practised by the Roman Church in this country cannot impose upon the Catholics, it certainly imposes upon a very large number of Protestants. Of course the Church knows this and keeps it up smilingly. Too many Protestants are deceived, because they imagine that the Church of Rome has made so many concessions to American ideas and American practices from sincere conviction or from a praiseworthy desire to adapt herself to the ways of this country. The real object of that Church is to "win us with honest trifles to betray in deepest consequence." The Roman Church may change her policy, but she cannot without self destruction change her tendency. Her tendency has always been, and always will be, to rule, to domineer, to have absolute power. It is lust of power which holds that wonderful organization together. Wherever she has ruled in the past she has ruled absolutely. Her power was, and to some extent still is, paramount to that of the state in Spain and in Italy and in Austria. What effects her rule has had in these and other countries the student of history knows only too well. It was said of the Bourbons that they could not learn, nor could they forget. The Roman Church forgets nothing, but she learns much. She assails the memory of Luther and of Knox and of Calvin with as bitter and inhuman a spirit to-day as she did 300 years ago, but she is careful not to preach too loudly or too

openly the abuses that caused the Reformation. She believes to-day as she did centuries ago all the absurd and revolting doctrines of indulgences, but she is sensible enough to keep such things in the background in a Protestant country.

The Roman Church knows that her ascent to absolute power in this country must be slow, and she recognizes the fact that it will be difficult, but she will always be striving to obtain this power. To ask the fire not to burn is not one whit more absurd than to expect the Roman Church to stop striving after absolute power. That Church does not believe herself free in this country. Her freedom is only realized when every other form of worship is suppressed. She has won much even in her own estimation, but she has won nothing if she has not won all.

We live in too enlightened and too Christian a century to disobey the Words of Him who commanded us to love one another. We cannot, and we should not, enact measures of force against even so desperate and plotting an enemy as Rome. We must try to convert the Catholics, and we can do this only by preaching Christ and by exposing the fallacies of Rome.

It has been said that there is no half-way house between Romanism and infidelity. Was there no half-way house for Wickliffe and for Huss and for Luther? They rejected Popery, and were the better Christians for it. There is indeed a half-way house between Romanism and spiritual death, but, alas, it is not made known as it ought to be. Protestants spend millions for converting pagans, and

that is right. But is not Romanism more dangerous to Christianity and to human progress than the superstition of ignorant savages? To convert a pagan is certainly a good and meritorious work, but is it better, is it more meritorious than to convert a Catholic? There would be far more converted Catholics if there were a more vigorous propaganda on the part of Protestantism. The Church of Rome is constantly making appeals to Protestants to "come back to the ancient faith." The Roman Church works with the aid of falsehood and deceit; the Protestant Church works with the aid of Christ. Why is it then that the Roman Church makes any converts? It is simply because Protestants do not realize their duty; because they do not keep up that spirit which gave them both a name and a glorious existence. There are few who are both willing and capable of expounding the doctrine of Christ as against the system of Rome. To enlighten ignorance is difficult; to combat prejudice is far more so. No man who is not by his own personal experience familiar with the errors and the terrible falseness of Rome knows how to go about this difficult work. The Roman Catholic Church prefers to see one of her members an infidel rather than a Protestant. She teaches and trains the minds of her adherents in such a way that when they leave Rome they feel a very powerful temptation to turn their backs on Christianity also. Here the Protestant churches should step in. They should never cease to proclaim the fact of a true Christianity. They should take particular pains to preach this fact in places where it will reach Catholics. It is very easy to

blame a Roman Catholic for leaving Christ when he leaves Rome, but it is a Christian and wise policy to consider his peculiarly unfortunate position and treat him with gentleness, with consideration and indulgence. Some short-sighted Protestants think that when a man upon leaving Rome does not at once come over to the Christian faith he is lost to them and ought to be considered an irreclaimable infidel or agnostic. These persons do not realize what a fearful effect the awakening from Roman errors has upon even the strongest of human minds. In the Catholic mind Christianity and Rome have always been identified. Every effort of the Church to which he belonged had been directed toward filling him with contempt and indifference for Protestantism if he cared to study and read. If he was a man of no studious habits the Church either said nothing about Protestantism or stuffed his brain with the vilest lies about true Christianity. What are we to do with such a man when he at last discovers the deceit and the errors of Rome? Does not his condition call for gentleness and patience? Is it not just and reasonable to give him time to recover from the awful shock before we condemn him? And is it not the duty of Christians who are interested in missionary work to lead him to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus?

The Protestants of America do not realize what a field is before them. They should know that theirs may be the inestimable privilege of at once spreading the light of Christianity and of averting a great and growing danger from their country.

Father McGlynn on the Parochial and Public Schools.

The school question was again discussed by Father McGlynn at the usual Sunday evening meeting, May 8, when he said of the parochial schools, that they had been established by men who wanted to see the old order of things revived, who were out of sympathy with the progress of the Republic, loved to see monarchy established again, and who wanted to make a living in that way.

Dr. McGlynn's great lecture on this subject, "The Public Schools and their Enemies," should be heard by every American citizen. It can be read in a neat tract of 32 pages, which will be forwarded to any address for 3 cents a copy. For general distribution it can be had at these rates: 10 copies 20 cents; 50 copies 75 cents; 100 copies \$1.25; 500 copies \$5.00. Address this office.

FIFTY CENTS A YEAR.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC will be sent to pastors with small salaries and Y.M.C.A. reading rooms in every city in the United States and Canada for fifty cents a year. It will do incalculable good to the young men, Protestants as well as Catholics, who frequent those rooms. To Catholics also it will be sent for fifty cents a year.

KIND WORDS.

From the *Chicago Free Methodist*, May 18, 1892:

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC for May comes with thirty-two pages of neatly printed matter calculated alike to enlighten Roman Catholics and Protestants on the nature, designs, spirit and delusions of the Roman Church. Father O'Connor, having been educated in the Catholic faith, and having renounced it at such great peril, is a reliable journalist, and his statements and judgment have a weight which those of a mere adventurer or unknown person could never command. At \$1.00 a year this is a cheap publication and should have a wide circulation.

THE REMISSION OF SIN—THE BIBLE VERSUS ROME.

BY REV HENRY LYMAN-WHEATON.

IN asserting that confession of sin must be made to God, and to God alone—that it must be personal and direct without the intervention of priest or Pope—I am asserting what I know to be at variance with the doctrine of the Church of Rome, not only in theory as learned from her authorized books, but in long practice of her ceremonies and through the wearisome round of her spiritual exercises.

It was not until the thirteenth century that the subject of auricular confession was definitely decided by ecclesiastical law. Then, by the Fourth Council of Lateran (1215) it was authoritatively enjoined, and the Council of Trent (1563) decreed that "whoever shall affirm that the practice of secretly confessing to the priest alone, as it has been ever observed from the beginning by the Catholic Church, and is still observed, is foreign to the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention—let him be accursed." From then till now this doctrine has been widely accepted and strenuously advocated; but in the present day special efforts are being made stealthily to spread this belief. It becomes, therefore, our solemn duty to inquire into the teachings of Holy Scripture and fortify ourselves upon the question. We shall see that the spirit and letter of the Bible leads to the unwavering conclusion that confession to and absolution from a priest are wholly unscriptural and totally antagonistic to the divine glory. But the fact that there are passages of Scripture employed as the strongholds of Romanism on this question is a

reason why those passages should receive special attention.

The first of these is that found in Matthew 16 : 18-19 : "Thou art Peter: and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." A corresponding passage is also found in Matt. 18 : 18. In the first instance the power to bind and loose is given to St. Peter only; in the second passage the very same authority is accorded to all the apostles. The question, therefore, at once arises, What was the nature of the authority thus conferred upon the apostles? The answer is discovered in the mode of speech prevalent among the Jews at the time Jesus spoke. In accordance with rabbinical phraseology, binding and loosing were equivalent to prohibiting and permitting. To "bind" was to tie down to a certain course of action; to "loose" was to give liberty of action. These words, then, applied to the apostles conveyed this thought, that they, as the first teachers of Christian truth and the first pastors of Christian churches, would occupy a position of solemn and unparalleled responsibility; that whatever they, guided by the Divine Spirit, taught as duty should be inculcated to future generations and be obligatory on all; and whatever they forbade should be denounced and shunned. The thought is this, that they were laying the foundation of the

faith and practice of Christ's followers everywhere through all ages, and what they enacted men would do or not do, as the case may be. There is not a word designed to convey authority to retain or pardon sin. And even if they received power to forgive sins there is not a shadow of an intimation that their authority could be transferred or bequeathed to others.

The next portion of Scripture to which attention is called is that found in John 20: 22-23: "And when He had said this He breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." In dealing with this text let one or two things, conveyed by the context, be borne in mind. First, the communication, whatever it was, was limited. Thomas, we read in the succeeding verses, was not present on the occasion, and therefore could not be included in the bestowment. Hence Thomas was not an apostle on the same qualifications as the other ten. Not receiving this peculiar authority he could not transmit it. All he did, therefore, as an apostle must, according to the Roman theory, have been invalid, and all successors by the line of St. Thomas must be equally irregular and imperfect. Second, others beside the apostles were present. It was the weekly meeting of disciples, not the college of apostles only. Hence whatever was conveyed by Christ in that little company was conveyed to all. He did not select one or a few, but on all He breathed His blessing. The endowment, whatever it was, was not confined to the apostolic line. Third, whatever was the

prerogative of those who received the risen Saviour's blessing, there is not the slightest intimation given that any of them understood the qualification could be, or was to be, transmitted. Indeed, it is specially deserving of attention that these words of Christ were never afterwards used in the early Church. When Matthias was elected to fill the place of Judas, and when St. Paul entered upon the work of the ministry, there is no record of any apostle endowing them with power for their office.

But, now, what was the power with which the Saviour invested His servants? I reply, Jesus makes special reference to the jurisdiction of His disciples in the churches. It is as though the Head of the Church said, "You go forth and teach My truth; the result will be the conversion of men who will soon organize societies of believers; into these societies, or churches, there will come some who will be troublers; some who, by their conduct, will require the legislative interference of the Church; and hence do you, My apostles, in conjunction with My disciples, who may be in fellowship with you, see carefully to it that such jurisdiction be exercised."

I do not think the apostles were commissioned to deal with all sin, but simply with sins between man and man—such sins as would reasonably form a question for ecclesiastical legislation.

This interpretation of Christ's words is established by the conduct of the apostles as afterwards recorded. Surely if they were invested with authority to receive auricular confession and dispense absolution we shall find some instances in which they exercised

their functions. Certainly if the prerogative to remit or retain guilt were one of their distinctive qualifications they will narrate repeated instances in which the divinely imported power was used. But no; the Acts of the Apostles and their Epistles are wholly silent on such a matter. There is not a single instance throughout the New Testament of an apostle authoritatively and judicially forgiving sin. The apostles teach the evil of sin and they point to Christ as the only Saviour. They employ every conceivable method of presenting divine truth in order to conduct men to the Redeemer; but they never forgive sin in the name of Jesus.

When Simon Magus desired to purchase the Spirit's power, St. Peter did no more than exhort him to repent of his wickedness and pray to God if perhaps the thoughts of his heart might be forgiven him. Look also at St. Paul when the Philippian jailer cried out, "What must I do to be saved." Did St. Paul "declare and pronounce" to the jailer, penitent as he was, the absolution and remission of his sins? No! He said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." The writings of St. James and St. John suffice to show that no priestly power was claimed by them and that they would direct every sinner to trust only in the word, power and love of the world's Redeemer.

Whilst, then, there are no instances in which the apostles heard a confession of sin, or remitted sin in general, there are instances in which the apostles pronounced a verdict on sins ecclesiastical; sins which were injurious to the Christian community; sins which called for the discipline of the Church.

The cases of Ananias and Sapphira, of Elymas the sorcerer and of the members of the Church of Corinth, found guilty of a foul crime, are cases in point. There are no instances of "loosing" or "binding," forgiving or retaining sin, except in the sense of ecclesiastical offences and ecclesiastical discipline.

There is one other passage cited in support of auricular confession—viz, James 3: 16: "Confess your faults one to another." On this text the Romanists thus write: "The precept here means that we must confess to whom God hath appointed, and who, by their ordination and jurisdiction, have received the power of remitting sins in His name." How such a meaning can be drawn from such a passage I am wholly at a loss to divine. There is not a word about priesthood; not a word about periodical unfolding of the secrets of the heart in order to pardon. The duty enjoined is reciprocal—confess "one to another"—so that if auricular confession be at all implied, then the priest should exchange places with the penitent and the penitent with the priest. What James here inculcates is precisely what his Lord and Master taught when He said: "If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there remember that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift."

Such, then, are the portions of Scripture upon which the advocates of the confessional base their creed and practice, but a study of those passages will clearly show how sandy is the foundation on which it is erected.

LIVES AND MIRACLES OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SAINTS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ROMAN BREVIARY, BY JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

CHAPTER II.

A brief sketch of the process of canonisation will enable the reader to understand the lives and miracles of Roman Catholic saints recorded in the Breviary. Canonisation is a ceremony in the Church of Rome by which persons deceased are ranked in the catalogue of saints. There are three steps necessary to be raised to this degree—first, Venerable; second, Blessed; third, Saint. The rules to be observed at canonisation were prescribed by Pope Urban VIII. in 1643, and by Benedict XIV., who published a volume on the subject. But the process dates back to a much more remote antiquity. At first it was only a commemoration of the martyrs whose assistance was invoked for the militant church to which they belonged; the decision, whether or not the candidate had fairly vindicated his claim to the honor, was left to the bishop. At the beginning we only find martyrs admitted into the category of saints. Soon, however, this privilege was extended to such men as showed a certain piety, but without sealing their testimony with their blood. But when the Church of Rome saw her power ascendant in Europe, she assumed to herself the important privilege of canonisation, and in later centuries she has admitted into the catalogue of saints potentates whose claim seems to have largely consisted in the support of the Popes in their temporal interests. As long as the right of according this favor of canonisation was in the hands of bishops, there was no public guarantee that it had been exercised with discretion; but when it passed into the hands of the Popes elaborate precautions were taken to prevent any but devout persons from being enrolled in the holy category. We shall see in the course of these sketches whether such means were effectual. The process of canonisation is a long and expensive one. A period of 100 years must elapse between the death of a person and his admission into the calendar. Time was when private families who had influence at the court of Rome could get one of their deceased members canonised, but the process of later years is so expensive that only rich religious orders can have the honor of having one of their number canonised.

The first step of the process is a formal inquiry by the bishop of the diocese as to the virtues and miraculous power of the deceased. Documents and witnessses are examined, and the result of these investigations are sent to Rome, where a *promotor fidei*, or "devil's advocate," examines them to discover flaws or weak points in the evidence adduced. When all objections have been met and the large fees required have been paid into the Papal treasury, the Pope issues a special brief and appoints a day for the "beatification" of the person named. This does not specifically declare the deceased out of purgatory, but it assumes that he or she is now in heaven and can be venerated and invoked in prayer. Then, when at least two miracles have been wrought through the intercession of the "blessed" deceased, a bull of canonisation is issued by the

Pope in the following words : " Deeming it to be just and due that we should give glory, praise and honor on earth to those whom God honors in heaven, we, with the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, the patriarchs, archbishops bishops, and abbots, etc., have decided and defined the blessed N—— to be a Saint, and have him [or her] on the catalogue of saints, as, by the terror of these presents, we do decide, define and inscribe him [or her]; appointing that his [or her] memory shall be cherished and honored with pious devotion by the universal Church. We therefore bless God that He hath granted to us in the Church a new patron and intercessor with his divine majesty, for the greater tranquility of the same Church, the spread of the Catholic faith, and enlightenment and conversion of heretics." The bull ends with the date and the signature of the Pope and the cardinals, after the manner of other legal and royal documents issued by kings and queens in making lords, counts, dukes and princes.

When the person has been thus formally declared a saint, a history of his or her life and the miracles wrought is prepared from the documents used in the process of canonisation. This is declared authentic by the Pope and forms the "lessons" of the Breviary. The world at large may not believe in the history of the saint's life and miracles there recorded, but no Roman Catholic can deny their authenticity after the Pope's declaration. The Breviary from which the following sketches are translated has been pronounced correct in all respects.

For May 12 the patron saints are "The brothers Nereus and Achilles, the eunuchs of Flavia Domitilla, who, with their mistress and her mother Plautilla, were baptized by St. Peter. When they advised Domitilla to consecrate her virginity to God, her husband, Aurelian, accused them of being Christians and banished them to the island of Pontia." From this we see that the priest in the family began his work in the Roman Church at an early date, and he continues it to the present time. When the husband or father cannot be brought under the influence of the Church the wife or mother becomes the instrument of the priests in wreaking vengeance upon them. Domitilla, the mistress of these eunuchs, is also commemorated as a virgin and martyr. The fifth lesson of the Breviary for May 12 says, "She was the niece of the Emperors Titus and Domitian, and had received the veil of virginity from the blessed Pope Clement. When accused of being a Christian by her spouse, Aurelian, the son of the Consul Titus Aurelius, the Emperor Domitian banished her into the island of Pontia, where she suffered a long martyrdom in prison." But her eunuchs Nereus and Achilles were with her, and their company must have been some consolation to her. It is to be presumed that Domitian knew that the men were eunuchs or he would have caused them to be separated from the lady Domitilla. The priests of Rome, ancient and modern, would be more worthy of respect if they had been like Nereus and Achilles.

It may be noted that doubt has been cast on the personality of Domitilla by Alban Butler and the Bollandists, not to speak of the historian Gibbon, who says the Emperors Titus and Domitian had no niece of that name. It must be

another person's life and adventures that the holy Roman doctors compiled and embodied in the Breviary. But a little inconsistency or mistaken identity does not count with those brethren.

Boniface, martyr, is the saint for May 14, though his feast can be transferred. Of him we read that "he was a Roman citizen who had lived in sin with the noble lady Aglae. . . . His flesh was torn off with iron claws; sharp reeds were drawn between his finger nails and the quick, and molten lead poured into his mouth. He was afterward dipped into a vessel of boiling pitch, and as he was taken out uninjured, the Judge in anger commanded him to be beheaded. . . . When the lady Aglae was told of his death, which was communicated to her by an angel, she repented of her sin with great contrition, and built a church in the name of Boniface, wherein his body was buried upon the fifth day of June next after that fourteenth of May, whereon in the city of Torsus in Cilicia, under the Emperors Diocetian and Maximian, he had passed to heaven." I like to give credit to the historical writers of the Breviary for their exactness, but I am sorry they did not gratify the curiosity of many priests of our day who jokingly asked for further information about the lady Aglae.

St. Venantius, martyr, is the hero of May 18 who "was cast into prison and bound with chains, but an angel loosed him—*ab angelo solutus*. He was afterwards suspended from a lamp post and scarified, with his head downward and his mouth filled with smoke, and a second time was delivered by an angel and was seen walking on the smoke dressed in a white garment—*ab angelo iterum solutum, candida veste supra fumum ambulantiem*. Venantius was again cast into prison, when his teeth and jaws were broken, and thus half-dead he was cast upon a dunghill. But from that he was also delivered by an angel—*inde ab angelo quoque ereptus*. After this deliverance, when Venantius stood before the Judge and spoke to him, the latter fell from the judgment seat dead, exclaiming with a loud voice, 'The God of Venantius is true; destroy our gods.' When the President was told of this he ordered Venantius to be thrown to the lions, but the beasts, laying aside their natural ferocity, lay down at his feet. Then he was cast from a high rock without being hurt; and when the soldiers who dragged him through rough places for a mile were suffering from thirst, Venantius, by making the sign of the cross, caused water to flow from a stone, whereon also he left the imprint of his knees, which can be seen even to this day in his church in Camerino. Then the President commanded him to be beheaded, and a few days afterwards died a most shameful death." Every priest must read that story under pain of mortal sin every eighteenth day of May, and believe it, or be everlastingly condemned.

We pass now from the lives of the martyrs—though we shall return to them in due time—to a sketch of Pope Celestine V. (May 19), "who was the son of respectable Catholic parents, and born in Apulia about the year 1221. He had scarcely entered boyhood when he retired into a desert to keep his soul safe from the allurements of the world. There he spent his time in heavenly meditation and wearing an iron chain next to his bare flesh, and from there he was chosen without his knowledge to fill the chair of Peter." But he was

forced to retire from the Papal throne after a few months, having suffered much from the factions that distracted the Church. The only miracle recorded of him is the appearance of a cross shining in the air before the door of his bedroom at the time of his death. Why he was placed in the calendar of saints is a puzzle to every priest who reads his office.

We now come to the history of a great man, whose feast is celebrated on May 25. As he was the greatest Pope of the Roman Church I quote at some length what the Breviary says: "Hildebrand, who reigned as Pope under the name of Gregory VII., was born at Saona in Tuscany. When a little child, as yet ignorant of his letters, he was one day playing at the feet of a carpenter who was planing wood, and the divine power guided his hand to arrange the shavings into the words of David, 'He shall have dominion from sea to sea,' thus signifying the great power he was to exercise in the world. Having set out for Rome to be educated under the protection of St. Peter, he found the freedom of the Church oppressed by the laity and the morals of the clergy so depraved that he vehemently grieved over them—*depravatos ecclesiarum mores vehementius dolens*. He entered the monastery of Cluny and observed the severest rules of the order of St. Benedict, and was soon elected prior. But divine providence had greater work for him to do, and after leaving Cluny he was first elected abbot of the monastery of St. Paul-without-the-walls of Rome, and afterwards created a cardinal of the Roman Church, discharging great duties under several Popes. When Victor II. sent him to France, he, by a miracle, forced the bishop of Lyons, who was infected by the sin of simony, to confess his guilt; and in the Council of Tours he compelled Berenger to again retract his heresy, and he also suppressed the schism of Cadolaus." I interrupt the narrative here to say that Berenger was the most learned priest of the eleventh century. He was archdeacon of Angers, and by his sermons and writings declared that the doctrine of transubstantiation was false. A retraction was wrung from him, but like Galileo at a later period when he was compelled to deny that the earth moves around the sun, Berenger held to his opinion to the last. He had very many followers, but Gregory was able to impose silence upon them, even as Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn and his followers have been suppressed in our day. Transubstantiation is as false in theology as the teaching of the Pope and the Inquisition that the sun moves around the earth is false in science. Berenger and Galileo were condemned by Rome, but the truths of theology and science stand forever, and Catholics themselves will deride the anathema hurled at Berenger even as they laugh at the condemnation of Galileo. The "schism of Cadolaus" was the work of the anti-Pope Honorius II. The corruption of doctrine and morals in the Church was so great at that period that three Popes claimed to be the only true vicar of Christ at the same time, and endeavored to remedy the abuses. But as the Popes themselves were as corrupt as their followers their efforts proved fruitless.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]